

ML 60 000

AD 0668331

584

U. S. NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH ACTIVITY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92152

TECHNICAL BULLETIN STB 68-9

FEBRUARY 1968

THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK IN PREDICTING NROTC OFFICER RETENTION: PART II. FAKABILITY

Norman M. Abrahams
Idell Neumann
William H. Githens

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR PUBLIC
RELEASE AND SALE; ITS DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED



20050718069

AN ACTIVITY OF THE BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

NOTE: The contents of this publication do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of the Navy.

THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK IN PREDICTING
NROTC OFFICER RETENTION: PART II.
FAKABILITY

Norman M. Abrahams
Idell Neumann
William H. Githens

February 1968

PF0160701B02
Technical Bulletin STB 68-9

Submitted by

B. Rimland, Ph.D., Director, Personnel Measurement Research Department

Approved by

E. E. Dudek, Ph.D., Technical Director
G. W. Watson, Commander, USN
Commanding Officer

This document has been approved for public release and sale;
its distribution is unlimited

U. S. Naval Personnel Research Activity
San Diego, California 92152

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Problem

Since 1964, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank has been administered to NROTC (Regular) applicants. Inasmuch as retention scale scores from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank are used in selection, it was essential to assess this scale's fakability.

Background

A great deal of civilian research has indicated the Strong Vocational Interest Blank to be of value in predicting occupational tenure. In addition, recent research at this activity on this instrument has indicated its value in predicting naval officer tenure.

Approach

The responses of several groups of subjects administered the Strong Vocational Interest Blank under a variety of conditions were contrasted. A scale reflecting differences between standard and faked responses was constructed and applied to a variety of NROTC samples for comparisons.

Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations

Under instructions to do so, some individuals can increase their scores by faking. However, for NROTC applicants it appears that while there is a slight tendency for applicants to fake responses, as measured by a fake detection scale, there is very little actual gain on the retention scale itself.

It was recommended that since faking does not appear to be a serious problem, the use of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank career retention scale be continued in officer selection.

• •

•

Official Business

100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000

•

Report Title & No.: THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK IN PREDICTING NROTC OFFICER RETENTION: PART II. FAKABILITY (STB 68-9)

1. Evaluation of Report. Please check appropriate column.

| FACTORS | RATING | | | COMMENTS |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|------|----------|
| | LOW | AVG | HIGH | |
| Usefulness of Data | | | | |
| Timeliness | | | | |
| Completeness | | | | |
| Technical Accuracy | | | | |
| Validity of Recommendations | | | | |
| Soundness of Approach | | | | |
| Presentation and Style | | | | |
| Other | | | | |

2. Use of Report. Please fill in answers as appropriate.

- a. What are your main uses for the material contained in the report?
- b. What changes would you recommend in report format to make it more useful?
- c. What types of research would be most useful to you for the Chief of Naval Personnel to conduct?
- d. Do you wish to remain on our distribution list?
- e. Please make any general comments you feel would be helpful to us in planning our research program.

NAME: _____ CODE: _____

ORGANIZATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Summary and Conclusions | iii |
| A. BACKGROUND | 1 |
| B. PROCEDURES AND RESULTS | 1 |
| C. CONCLUSIONS | 7 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. SVIB N-5 Scores for OCS Students Under Faked and Standard Administrations | 2 |
| 2. SVIB S-1 Scores for OCS Students Under Faked and Standard Administrations | 3 |
| 3. Comparison of NROTC Applicants and Freshmen on S-1 and N-5 Scales | 3 |
| 4. Comparison of NROTC Selectees Retested as Freshmen on S-1 and N-5 Scales | 4 |
| 5. Comparison of NROTC Sophomore Fake and Standard SVIB Administrations on S-1 and N-5 Scales | 6 |
| 6. Comparison of NROTC Applicants, NROTC (Regular) Commissioned Officers, and Test-Retest Samples on N-5 Scale | 7 |

FIGURE

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Bivariate Distribution of N-5 Scores for 249 NROTC Students Tested as Applicants and Retested as Freshmen | 5 |
|--|---|

THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK IN PREDICTING
NROTC OFFICER RETENTION: PART II.
FAKABILITY

A. BACKGROUND

As part of the development and evaluation of test instruments for Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) selection, the 1964 revision of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) was administered to 1,900 NROTC officers on active duty in 1964. The interest responses of officers who had served 4-6 years beyond obligated duty were compared with those of officers who left active duty within six months after completing their obligation. A naval officer retention scale, referred to as N-5, was developed by selecting the item responses with a percentage difference of 10 or greater. This scale provided excellent separation on the criterion samples and its validity, though somewhat reduced, remained high on a variety of cross-validation samples.

Despite the impressive validities cited in Part I of this report, information on fakability is essential for any test before it may be recommended for use in selection. If a test is found to be faked under operational conditions, provisions for fake detection or prevention must be instituted. Furthermore, since it has been shown in many studies that some individuals distort their responses to the SVIB in a manner that improves their selection-relevant scores, it was necessary to investigate the fakability of the officer retention scale. This report presents data on the fakability of the retention scale as well as on the construction of a scale for detecting dissimulation.

B. PROCEDURES AND RESULTS

The SVIB was administered to a sample of 122 Officer Candidate School (OCS) students twice--once under standard and once under fake instructions. Under the standard instructions, subjects were told to answer the items as they normally would. Under the fake administration, subjects were instructed to respond as they believed a career naval officer would respond.

The actual instructions for the fake administration were:

"When you complete the Strong Vocational Interest Blank this time, you are asked to use all of the knowledge you have about the vocational interests of a career naval officer. Respond to the items as nearly like a CAREER naval officer as you can."

Table 1 provides a summary of the results for the N-5 Scale on this group. These data clearly indicate that under instructions to do so, the retention scale (N-5) can be faked by most subjects. The subjects raised

TABLE 1
SVIB N-5 Scores for OCS Students Under Faked
and Standard Administrations

| Administration | N | \bar{X} | S.D. | Percentage Overlap | \underline{Z} |
|----------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Standard | 122 | 93.56 | 14.51 | 71 | 9.93 |
| Faked | 122 | 103.79 | 13.19 | | |

their scores from a mean of 93.56 to a mean of 103.79, an increase which is statistically significant beyond the .001 probability level. One interesting finding not shown in the means is that 39 subjects actually lowered their scores, four subjects maintained the same score, and 79 subjects increased their scores. The correlation between the two sets of N-5 scores was .18.

Because of the apparent fakability of the N-5 Scale, it was essential to attempt the development of a scale to detect faking. By comparing responses of the OCS sample made under the fake and standard administrations, 120 item responses having a percentage difference of 20 or greater were identified. Of these, 30 were scored responses on the N-5 Scale. These 30 responses were not included in the fake scale since other items not related to retention are available for an independent estimate of dissimulation. Consequently, the fake scale, referred to henceforth in this report as S-1, contains 90 item responses.

Examination of the item content in this scale reveals several interesting trends. The stereotypes represented in the faked items include more frequent endorsement of mechanical and technical interests, aggressive leadership and management interests, physical activity and outdoor interests, and pursuits of a practical nature. There is also a marked tendency to avoid items representing aesthetic interests.

The final key was scored so that each item indicating faking received a +1 weight. When a response was selected more frequently by fakers it was scored +1, and when a response was avoided, i.e., endorsed less under faking instructions, the alternatives were scored -1. The results of scoring the OCS samples on the S-1 Scale are shown in Table 2. While the S-1 Scale discriminates extremely well between the two administrations, these data are not conclusive since they were used in key construction.

As a check on this scale, additional data were available. Assuming that the fake scale is capable of identifying faking, a group motivated to

TABLE 2
SVIB S-1 Scores for OCS Students Under Faked
and Standard Administrations

| Administration | N | \bar{X} | S.D. | Percentage Overlap |
|----------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------------------|
| Standard | 122 | 27.30 | 8.09 | 30 |
| Faked | 122 | 46.31 | 10.23 | |

fake should obtain higher scores than a group not so motivated. Applicants who were selected ($N = 1,300$) in the 1964 NROTC program were presumably motivated to fake while a sample ($N = 269$) from this group that was retested at the end of their freshman year should not be so motivated. The S-1 scores for these groups were obtained and are presented in Table 3. The means for the applicant and freshman administration, 32.7 (S. D. = 6.5), and 29.5 (S. D. = 6.8), respectively, indicate a decrease of approximately one half of a sigma unit. Given this indication that faking was attempted, did the N-5 scores also decrease? The applicant N-5 mean shifted from 105.1 (S. D. = 13.1) to 103.04 (S. D. = 15.2) when retested as freshmen, or only .14 sigma units. Since factors other than faking may easily account for this small change, a comparison was necessary that provided more stringent control.

TABLE 3
Comparison of NROTC Applicants and Freshmen
on S-1 and N-5 Scales

| Selectees Tested as | N | S-1 Scale | | N-5 Scale | |
|------------------------|-------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
| | | \bar{X} | S.D. | \bar{X} | S.D. |
| Applicants | 1,300 | 32.7 | 6.8 | 105.10 | 13.1 |
| Freshmen | 269 | 29.5 | 6.8 | 103.04 | 15.2 |

To provide such a comparison, SVIB's for the 269 individuals retested as freshmen could be compared with their SVIB's taken as applicants. Since some freshmen did not take the SVIB as applicants, only 249 of the possible 269 pairs of answer sheets were available for this comparison. Figure 1 presents a bivariate distribution of N-5 scores of this sample. Inspection of this scatter plot reveals little tendency for individual shifts in N-5 score from the motivated to the nonmotivated administration. Further, the correlation is .67 between N-5 scores on the two administrations.

Further evidence on faking and its effects may be obtained from this sample's means on N-5 and S-1, shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Comparison of NROTC Selectees Retested as
Freshmen on S-1 and N-5 Scales

| Administration | N | S-1 Scale | | N-5 Scale | |
|----------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| | | \bar{X} | S. D. | \bar{X} | S. D. |
| Selectee | 249 | 32.1 | 6.22 | 104.6 | 15.0 |
| Freshmen | 249 | 29.4 | 6.95 | 103.4 | 13.0 |

On the fake scale the selection situation mean for this group was 32.1 (S. D. = 6.22), and the retest mean was 29.4 (S. D. = 6.95). On the N-5 scale these means were 104.6 (S. D. = 15) and 103.4 (S. D. = 13), respectively. These differences indicate that although some faking is attempted or, at least, that some response distortion occurs, little gain (i.e., less than one tenth of a standard deviation) is made on the career officer scale. This is probably due to a small group of item responses on the N-5 scale that are faked in the wrong direction. An alternative explanation is that freshmen, even though they were in the NROTC program, still believe it is necessary to appear motivated. While this is no doubt true for some individuals, the half-standard deviation drop on S-1 argues against such a general interpretation.

An additional sample of 20 NROTC college sophomores was instructed to respond as they thought a career Navy officer would. By comparing their fake scale (S-1) mean and career scale (N-5) mean with those of a group of sophomores

(N = 10) responding to the SVIB normally, the effects of faking may be further assessed. These means, presented in Table 5, indicate that faking was attempted by the sophomores instructed to fake, as shown by the difference in S-1 scores. Despite this intentional attempt to fake, their N-5 scores were not improved. These results, which indicate little improvement in N-5, are in direct contrast to the results obtained when OCS subjects were instructed to fake.

TABLE 5
Comparison of NROTC Sophomore Fake and Standard
SVIB Administrations on S-1 and N-5 Scales

| Administration | N | S-1 Scale | | N-5 Scale | |
|----------------|----|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| | | \bar{X} | S. D. | \bar{X} | S. D. |
| Standard | 10 | 28.3 | 8.4 | 102.5 | 14.3 |
| Fake | 20 | 33.3 | 10.0 | 102.3 | 11.4 |

These comparisons involving NROTC students, taken together, indicate that while in a motivated situation some faking is attempted, career scale scores are not improved. The most likely explanation for this finding is that N-5 includes some items that are typically faked in the "incorrect" direction. As a consequence, while individuals trying to fake will tend to endorse more items that are scored positively on the N-5 scale, they will also tend to endorse more that are scored negatively. Perhaps the reason for the OCS subjects' "successful" faking may be attributed to their standard administration scores being very much lower than in other samples. As a result, more "room" is available for score increases.

One final set of comparisons provides additional insight into applicant faking. These comparisons may be made by examining the data reproduced from Part I of this report in Table 6. First, these data show a considerable advantage on N-5 for applicants over officers commissioned in 1961 and still on obligated duty. Due to attrition throughout the NROTC college years, it would be logical to expect a higher mean score for the commissioned group rather than the lower mean noted. If, however, substantial faking occurred among applicants, this difference might be expected. Another explanation is that the difference found could be due to a reduction in the kind of interests represented in the career scale, due to such factors as increasing

TABLE 6

Comparison of NROTC Applicants, NROTC (Regular)
Commissioned Officers, and Test-Retest
Samples on N-5 Scale

| Sample | N | \bar{X} | S. D. |
|---------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| NROTC | | | |
| Applicants (1964) | 1,266 | 104.6 | 13.1 |
| Commissioned Officers (1961) | 646 | 93.0 | 16.0 |
| CIMR Ten-Year Group | | | |
| Test | 152 | 99.6 | 12.5 |
| Retest | 152 | 90.6 | 13.0 |
| CIMR Eight-Year Group | | | |
| Test | 171 | 100.0 | 13.0 |
| Retest | 171 | 92.5 | 12.7 |

age, change of values, etc. In this case it would be expected that had the officer sample been tested as applicants, their scores would have been similar to those of the present applicants. In fact, this interpretation has some empirical support. For two non-NROTC test-retest samples initially tested at age 17-18, scores on N-5 decreased approximately eight-tenths of a standard deviation over an eight and a ten year period. This decrease is approximately equal to the mean difference found on N-5 between applicants and officers. These data indicate that the major part of the score difference may be attributed to change of interests with increasing age rather than to faking. Furthermore, since the change also appeared in a non-NROTC sample, the change in interests cannot be attributed to experience in the NROTC program.

C. CONCLUSIONS

From the available data, the following conclusions seem warranted:

- (1) When instructed to do so, some individuals can increase their N-5 scores by faking.
- (2) As indicated by scores on a specially constructed fake scale (S-1), there is a slight tendency for applicants to fake responses, although there is very little actual gain on the N-5 retention scale.

- (3) From all available information, faking does not appear to be a serious problem and the continued use of the SVIB career scale in officer selection is recommended.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

BUPERS (Pers-A3) (15)

NPRL WASH (3)

Army Personnel Research Office
Washington (3)

Personnel Research Laboratory
Lackland AFB (3)

Defense Documentation
Center (20)

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

| | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|
| 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) U. S. Naval Personnel Research Activity San Diego, California 92152 | | 2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED | |
| | | 2b. GROUP | |
| 3. REPORT TITLE THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK IN PREDICTING NROTC OFFICER RETENTION: PART II. FAKABILITY | | | |
| 4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Final | | | |
| 5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name) Norman M. Abrahams, Idell Neumann, William H. Githens | | | |
| 6. REPORT DATE February 1968 | | 7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 15 | 7b. NO. OF REFS 0 |
| 8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. | | 9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) STB 68-9 | |
| b. PROJECT NO PF0160701B02 | | | |
| c. | | 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) | |
| d. | | | |
| 10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited | | | |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | 12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-A3) Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20370 | |
| 13. ABSTRACT <p>Since 1964, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) has been administered to NROTC (Regular) applicants. Inasmuch as retention scale scores from the SVIB are used in selection, it was essential to assess this scale's fakability.</p> <p>A great deal of civilian research has indicated the SVIB to be of value in predicting occupational tenure. In addition, recent research at this activity on this instrument has indicated its value in predicting naval officer tenure.</p> <p>The responses of several groups of subjects administered the SVIB under a variety of conditions were contrasted. A scale reflecting differences between standard and faked responses was constructed and applied to a variety of NROTC samples for comparison.</p> <p>Under instructions to do so, some individuals can increase their scores by faking. However, for NROTC applicants it appears that while there is a slight tendency for applicants to fake responses, as measured by a fake detection scale, there is very little actual gain on the retention scale itself.</p> <p>It was recommended that since faking does not appear to be a serious problem, the use of the SVIB career retention scale be continued in officer selection.</p> | | | |

DD FORM 1473 (PAGE 1)

S/N 0101-807-6801

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

